Report of the Shared Cataloging Program Advisory Committee Series Subgroup

June 2, 2006

John Riemer
Sharon Scott
Becky Culbertson
Lai-Ying Hsiung
Carole McEwan

Executive Summary

Series authority records make possible the hyperlinking and browsing of series in a web environment. Browsing within (authorized) series headings is more intuitive and less labor-intensive for users than keyword searching in obtaining a list of the titles issued within a particular series. Series authority records serve to track the varying names a given series appears under, as well as to differentiate series that have the same name. The authority records also have traditionally served to provide a base for tracking the consistent classification of volumes within a series, either collectively or separately.

With reference to the examples provided in this report, the UC library community should be surveyed to find the extent to which series authority work is still important. The feedback can identify the priority categories of series that should be covered after the Library of Congress contribution ends June 1st.

In the future, a good deal of the series authority benefits now enjoyed could be sustained by a shift to a strategy to post-cataloging control of series. Tools that could support this are authority vendor service options aimed at tracing a maximum number of series and the programmatic receipt of subsequent upgrades to the WorldCat record after the initial cataloging effort.

OCLC should be encouraged to carry out plans to offer widespread ability to create skeletal, non-NACO authority records that can be used to link up titles within a series. Any bibliographic record in WorldCat lacking an authorized series access point should be open to all OCLC members for upgrading.

Exclusive use of MARC 800-830 fields for series access points (discontinued use of 440s) would simplify series authority work in a number of ways. Other means of streamlining and simplifying series authority work ought to be investigated within UC and discussed at the national level.

Though we vary in opinion on the advisability of the LC series decision, we do agree there are benefits to be had from whatever amount of series headings libraries opt to control.

Purpose of This Report

Study the likely impact of the April 20 LC series treatment decision (text in Appendix A) on the UC campus libraries and make recommendations on what UC should do about it. (The new Cataloging and Metadata Advisory Committee within HOTS would normally weigh in on this, but the group is not in place yet.)

Assessment of Impact

Classification

Some libraries have followed LC series classification practice for series, to maximize the extent they can use LC copy as-is. In the case of any series that LC up until now classed as collection, e.g. "Advances in chemistry series," the cataloging copy will show LC now classing everything separately. If library users expect to see the newer volumes of such series shelved or browsable next to the older volumes, then libraries must go out of their way to retrieve, reclassify, and relabel the books in these series that arrive shelf ready.

For partially analyzable titles, without intervention, the volumes with distinctive titles will end up separately classed, while the unanalyzable volumes will end up by default classed as a collection.

Both of these situations will mislead those browsing online or at the shelf into thinking that the collectively classed volumes are all that the library has.

Access Points

Browsing of series headings, often hyperlinked on catalog records, is a lot more intuitive and less energy-consuming for patrons than searching these same series by keyword.

Currently, online publisher catalogs frequently offer users the "more like this" convenience of browsing the other titles in a given series, by clicking a series link on the description of one title. Try these two examples:
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=6798>
<http://lu.com/showbook.cfm?isbn=1591582350>

The new Endeca-based online catalog at North Carolina State http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/catalog/ offers similar hyperlinking of series fields. For an example, perform a search for any volume in "Advances in Chemistry Series." Click on the series field from that single record to retrieve the others in that series.

Series authority work makes those hyperlinks possible by pulling together the titles of a given series issued under variant names and by differentiating unrelated series with the same name. It seems regressive to have our catalogs pull back from the functionality that other discovery tools offer to users.

EXAMPLE 1

All the following variations of one series have historically been normalized in cataloging to a single authorized series access point:

Bulletin (California. Dept. of Water Resources)

Bulletin
Bulletin / California. Dept. of Water Resources
Bulletin / Department of Water Resources
Bulletin / Dept. of Water Resources
Bulletin / State of Calif., Dept. of Water Resources
Bulletin / State of California, Department of Water Resources
Bulletin / State of California, the Resources Agency, Department of Water
        Resources
California. Dept. of Water Resources. Bulletin
State of California. Dept. of Water Resources. Bulletin
1969-1974: Bulletin / California Dept. of Water Resources   [serial]

If the controlled series access point for all the titles in the series were to give way to transcriptions of the series statements found on the pieces, then:
1. Series heading browse capability would definitely be lost.
2. Series keyword retrieval would be a chancy thing because:
--Users would not know whether and how to include the words "Department" and "Calif[ornia]"
--The context of the state name is not always present in the series field.
--Keyword search results for the Resources Agency would be misleading if the Agency issues its own publications in series.

The following features of series statements transcribed into cataloging records make MARC 490 fields poor candidates for hyperlinking and browsing:

- Presence or absence of
  - initial articles
  - subtitles
  - statements of responsibility
  - multilingual presentations of the above
- Presence of ISSNs only in some of the issues
- Inconsistent captioning of numbering associated with the series
- Lack of subfielding to set off the numbering from the name of the series

For a review of the functions historically served by series authority records, complete with before-and-after examples of the impact of implementing LC's decision, please see Appendix B.

Appendix C contains a survey designed to gather key information from public services, collection development, and technical services staff, as campuses determine what policies on series to adopt in the wake of the LC decision.

Appendix D contains an assessment of how the ideas in the Bibliographic Services Task Force are applicable at the national level, using the new LC series policy as an example.

Recommendations and Conclusion

1. Ask for HOTS support in taking the survey in Appendix C to campuses.

2. In utilizing existing cataloging copy, pursue a strategy of controlling series after the fact, through authority vendors. These vendors, working with UC's recently-cataloged titles, would be asked to provide series access points for as many series as they are able, using available national series authority records and other resources.

3. If not all series can be brought under authority control, set priorities among those categories of series that would most benefit from it. Identification of the categories can be informed by the survey in Appendix C. Contributions by campuses of series authority records to the national file would also be guided by these priorities.

4. Adopt a practice of providing series access points in 8XX fields in all cases (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdsrae.html). Discontinue using MARC tag 440. Assume that this conforms to MARC 21 guidelines and does not require MARBI sanctioning. Benefits: simplicity of applying authority validation to series access points; OCLC's Connexion "control heading" functionality can then apply to all series headings.

5. Research ways to simplify the rules and decision making process for series access points; advocate a national-level discussion as well as participate in it.

6. Encourage OCLC to adopt a two-tiered authority record standard in WorldCat[*] (A) NACO records from those who can contribute them and (B) skeletal records from any other full member institution that is willing to help differentiate and link up series. (The latter can be turned into NACO records at any future point.) The point of this is to provide a form that can be hyperlinked.

7. Encourage OCLC to open up to all members the addition of fields 800-830 in any bibliographic record lacking those fields. (This is similar to what can now be done to records lacking 505, 856, MeSH; for provision of series access points, all institutions would be free to provide 800-830 and change field 490 0 to 490 1.)

8. Depending on the support on campuses for the authority work and the perceived need for the training, acquire UC training from LC series expert Judy Kuhagen. Use it to support series authority record creation.

---

[*] Rebecca Dean of OCLC articulated this strategy in the CORC Project days, 1999-2000.

Though we vary in opinion on the advisability of the LC series decision, we do agree there are benefits to be had from whatever amount of series headings libraries opt to control.

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/series.html

The Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Announces the Library of Congress' Decision to Cease Creating Series Authority Records as Part of Library of Congress Cataloging
April 20, 2006

Update: **Series Treatment Decision Delayed**

The Library of Congress has determined that it will cease to provide controlled series access in the bibliographic records that its catalogers produce. Its catalogers will cease creating series authority records (SARs). The Library considered taking this step over a decade ago, but decided against it at that time because of some of the concerns raised about the impact this would have. The environment has changed considerably since then--indexing and key word access are more powerful and can provide adequate access via series statements provided only in the 490 field of the bibliographic record. We recognize that there are still some adverse impacts, but they are mitigated when the gains in processing time are considered.

As the Library was considering introducing this change, it was heavily swayed by the number of records that included series statements. Using statistics for the most recent year with full output of records appearing in the LC Database (fiscal year 2004) gives a sense of the impact on the cataloging workload:

Total monograph records created: 344,362

Total with series statements: 82,447

Total SARs created: 8,770 (by LC catalogers); 9,453 (by Program for Cooperative Cataloging participants)

As a result of the Library's decision, the following explains what catalogers will and will not do, related to series.

What LC catalogers will do:
- Create a separate bibliographic record for all resources with distinctive titles published as parts of series (monographic series and multipart monographs).
- Give series statements in 490 0 fields.
- Classify separately each volume (i.e., assign call number and subject headings appropriate to the specific topic of the volume).
  (Imported copy cataloging records will have series access points removed and series statements changed to 490 0.)

What LC catalogers will not do:
- Create new SARs
- Modify existing SARs to update data elements or LC's treatment decisions
- Consult and follow treatment in existing SARs
- Update existing collected set records
- Change 4XX/8XX fields in completed bibliographic records when updating those records for other reasons

The Library's rationale includes:
1. Eliminates cost of constructing unique headings; searching to determine the existence of an SAR; creating SARs; and adjusting 8XX on existing bibliographic records.
2. Maintains current level of subject access.
3. In some instances, increases access because more titles will be classified separately
4. Maintains current level of descriptive access other than series. Uncontrolled series access will remain available through keyword searches.

The Library will be working with affected stakeholder organizations--OCLC, RLG, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and the larger library community to mitigate as much as possible the impact of this change.

The Library will implement this change on May 1, 2006. The Cataloging Policy and Support Office is revising affected documentation to be reissued to reflect these decisions.

Appendix B
Before-and-After Results of Discontinued Series Authority Work

The following examples reference the functions historically played by series authority records. The examples in some cases may not match what is found in UC cataloging files. Italics indicate what is expected to accumulate in a catalog, following implementation of LC's decision.

- See references for finding series

Before: Series names tend to have more variants and changes than other access points. Old policy do not use the variant forms as found on different items belonging to the same series, but add uniform qualifiers for collocation and for browsable linking of items in the same series.

<div style="float:right; border:1px solid; background:#ccc; padding:4px;">EXAMPLE 2</div>

Criminal justice (LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC)   46 entries

After: New policy will enter the form as found on the item as reflected by the italicized entries. It will be difficult for users to know that Criminal justice, Criminal justice recent scholarships and Criminal justice (LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC) are the same series

Criminal justice   *5 entries*
Criminal justice (LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC)   46 entries
  (no more new entries will appear under this heading, using LFB)
Criminal justice recent scholarship   *7 entries*

- Collocation by normalized heading, including presence/absence of initial articles

Before: Normalize abbreviations. Use the authorized form only

<div style="float:right; border:1px solid; background:#ccc; padding:4px;">EXAMPLE 3</div>

U.S. Army bicentennial series   3 entries
United States Army bicentennial series   see
  U.S. Army bicentennial series

After: Users have to check both places to account for all items in a series

U.S. Army bicentennial series   6 entries
United States Army bicentennial series   *3 entries*

<div style="float:right; border:1px solid; background:#ccc; padding:4px;">EXAMPLE 4</div>

Before: Users redirected to a single authorized form:

Food systems and society series   3 entries

Food systems monograph   see
  Food systems and society series

Food systems series   see
  Food systems and society series

Food systems and society series. Food systems monograph   see
  Food systems and society series

U.N.R.I.S.D. food systems see
  Food systems and society series

After: Users have to check several places for the same series, and they may not know that these forms are all the same series

Food systems and society series	5 entries
Food systems monograph	*2 entries*
Food systems series	*2 entries*
Food systems and society series. Food systems monograph	*1 entry*
U.N.R.I.S.D. food systems	*2 entries*

Before: Removal of foreign language initial article

EXAMPLE 5

Club Diogenes	6 entries

After: Splitting of file depending on presentation of initial articles on the items.

Club Diogenes	7 entries
El Club Diogenes	*2 entries*

- Differentiation of series with identical names

Differentiate unrelated series with the same name and allow browsable versus keyword access to series

EXAMPLE 6

Advances in psychology (Amsterdam, Netherlands)	68 entries
Advances in psychology (New York, N.Y.)	2 entries

After: New entries, without qualifiers and representing different series, will interfile.

Advances in psychology	*14 entries*
Advances in psychology (Amsterdam, Netherlands)	68 entries
Advances in psychology (New York, N.Y.)	2 entries

Additional example: The new postings under "Background paper" will represent multiple series as well as additional regular titles. General keyword searching on all fields may retrieve the item if "Technology Assessment" appears somewhere in the bibliographic record, such as corporate name (710), publisher (260 $b), or note fields (5XX)

Background paper   *45 entries*
Background paper (Great Britain. Royal Commission on the Distribution of Income and
    Wealth)   2 entries
Background Paper (United States. Congress. Office Of Technology Assessment) See also
    OTA background papers
Background paper (United States. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment)   71
entries
Background Paper (United States. Congress. Office Of Technology Assessment : 1991) –
    See HIV-related issues. Background paper
HIV-related issues. Background paper   4 entries
OTA background papers   8 entries

Before: Browsable entries with qualifiers

Publication series (Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers)   3 entries
Publications series (Joint Centre on Modern East Asia)   4 entries
Publications series (Madras Library Association)   5 entries

After: New entries accumulating at the beginning and encompassing different series.

Publication series   *56 entries*
Publication series (Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers)   3 entries
Publications series (Joint Centre on Modern East Asia)   4 entries
Publications series (Madras Library Association)   5 entries

- Control for multi-lingual presentations of the series name

Before: Direct users to title in original language

European university studies. Series II, Law   see
    Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe II, Rechtswissenschaft

Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe II, Rechtswissenschaft   30 entries

Publications universitaires européennes. Serie II, Droit   see
    Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe II, Rechtswissenschaft

After: Users have to check multiple places to account for all items in a series.

Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe II, Rechtswissenschaft   35 entries
European university studies. Series II, Law   *3 entries*
Publications universitaires européennes. Serie II, Droit   *2 entries*

- Clarify the relationships different phrases have, e.g. main series & subseries

Before: Browsable by clarifying the hierarchy of the series and subseries for collocation

Data evaluation and methods research see
  Vital and health statistics. Series 2, Data evaluation and methods research
.
Series 4, Documents and committee reports see
  Vital and health statistics. Series 4, Documents and committee reports
.
Vital and health statistics. Series 2, Data evaluation and methods research   5 entries
Vital and health statistics. Series 4, Documents and committee reports   3 entries
Vital and health statistics. Series 6, Cognition and survey measurement   4 entries

After: No longer browsable. Hierarchy of the series and subseries not clear. Users have to depend on keyword.

Cognition and survey measurement	*3 entries*
Data evaluation and methods research	*4 entries*
.	
Series 4, Documents and committee reports	*3 entries*
.	
Vital and health statistics. Series 2, Data evaluation and methods research	6 entries
Vital and health statistics. Series 4, Documents and committee reports	3 entries
Vital and health statistics. Series 6, Cognition and survey measurement	5 entries

Before: series and subseries for browsing

Law books recommended for libraries. Legal history   3 entries
.
Legal history see
  Law books recommended for libraries. Legal history

After: no longer in proper sequence.

Law books recommended for libraries. Legal history   5 entries
Legal history   *2 entries*

- FRBR support

Before: See references from series on items to series entered under personal name:

The annotated Shakespeare see
   Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f2003.|sYale University
Press

The Arden edition of the works of William Shakespeare   see
   Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1951

New Kittredge Shakespeares see
   Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1983.|sScott, Foresman

New Cambridge Shakespeare   see
   Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1984.|sCambridge University Press.

Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1951   4 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1983.|sScott, Foresman   2 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1984.|sCambridge University Press 8 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1987.|sNew American Library   3 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f2003.|sYale University Press   5 entries

Signet classic Shakespeare see
   Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1987.|sNew American Library.

After: Series as found on items will coexist with older series uniform titles. Series will no longer file with other monographic sets of Shakespeare's works, undermining FRBR:

New Cambridge Shakespeare   *5 entries*
New Kittredge Shakespeare   *2 entries*
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1951   4 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1983.|sScott, Foresman   2 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1984.|sCambridge University Press 8 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f1987.|sNew American Library   3 entries
Shakespeare, William,|d1564-1616.|tWorks.|f2003.|sYale University Press   5 entries
Signet classic Shakespeare   *1 entry*
The annotated Shakespeare   *3 entries*
The Arden edition of the works of William Shakespeare   *2 entries*

Other FRBR functions supported by series authority work include the whole-part relationship between a series and its member titles and the successor relationship between one series and one or more earlier and/or later series. (Ed Jones, writing to the FRBR discussion list)

Appendix C
Survey of UC Campuses on Series Access Practices and Policies

<For public services and collection development>

1. If series previously classed together now have current volumes getting classed separately, with keyword access to the series in the cataloging records, is this of High/Medium/Low concern?

2. If a series name changes or has variations in name, each which has to be searched individually in order to retrieve the entire series, how serious are the consequences to user discovery? See EXAMPLES 1-4 in this report. (High/Medium/Low importance)

3. If different series have the same name, how serious are the consequences of having all of them intermixed in during retrieval? See EXAMPLES 6-8 in this report. (High/Medium/Low importance)

4. If foreign language series are entered as they appear on the items, how serious are the consequences to user discovery? See EXAMPLES 5 and 9 in this report. (High/Medium/Low importance)

5. If a main series, any associated subseries, and their numbering are entered as presented on the items, how serious are the consequences to user discovery? See EXAMPLES 10-11 in this report. (High/Medium/Low importance)

6. Rate the importance of controlled series access (High/Medium/Low) of each of the following categories of material.
   a. Numbered series (H/M/L)
   b. Unnumbered series (H/M/L)
   c. Series statements whose wording differs significantly from the series access point (H/M/L)
   d. Series on standing order (H/M/L)
   e. Personal author series, e.g. The Arden Shakespeare. See EXAMPLE 12. (H/M/L)
   f. Series with earlier & later titles (H/M/L)
   g. Series in the sciences (H/M/L)
   h. Series in the humanities or social sciences (H/M/L)
   i. Conference publications in series, e.g. Proceedings of SPIE. (H/M/L)
   j. UC publications issued in series (H/M/L)
   k. Series on electronic publications (H/M/L)
   l. Series on hard-copy publications (H/M/L)
   m. Partially-analyzable series, at least some of which will inevitably be classified collectively (H/M/L)
   n. Other (specify): _____ (H/M/L)

7. Are there any types of series that you feel that we do not need to control?

8. Which of the following would be more important to allocate scarce cataloging resources to:
   a. Providing the kind of series control shown in the examples in this report
   b. Creating individual entries for each item in a series, with author, title, and subject access

<For technical services>

9. Local system indexing. Does your ILS index the following fields in your system?
   a. 490 0 ?
   b. 490 1 ?
   c. 440 ?
   d. 800-830 ?

10. Current series control practices.
    Are authority records consulted?
    Are authority records created in house?
    Are bibliographic record series fields edited?

For the categories below, please indicate whether the practices you follow above apply to all or only some of the material. What are the exceptions?

   a. Receipt of shelf-ready material
   b. In-house LC copy cataloging
   c. In-house non-LC copy cataloging
   d. In-house original cataloging
   e. Outsourced cataloging
   f. Processing of bibliographic records by authority vendors.

11. In the wake of LC's series decision implementation, is your campus likely to:
   a. Consult/create series authority records in order to prevent duplicate purchases in acquisition (Yes/No)
   b. Consult existing series authority records and follow the current classification practice (Yes/No)
   c. Consult existing authority records and follow the series form and tracing practice (Yes/No)
   d. Create authority records for new series (Yes/No)
   e. Just leave as-is the series fields found on cataloging copy (Yes/No)
   f. Convert series fields found on cataloging copy to 490 0 in following new LC practice (Yes/No)
   g. Retrospectively reclassify volumes, if the majority of the volumes in the same series have been classified collectively (Yes/No)

12. Will you be compensating for the new LC series policy by taking any of these measures?

   a. Delete any initial articles from series statements taken from the item (Yes/No)
   b. Adding corporate body access points (710 fields), to help with boolean keyword searching for series with generic titles (Yes/No)
   c. Treating any series-like phrases as 490 0 versus 500, to simplify decision-making (Yes/No)

13. If OCLC came up with a way for libraries to input new skeletal records that could then be later upgraded by a series NACO library, would you make use of this and enter these skeletal records in OCLC?

Appendix D
Applicability of the Ideas in the BSTF Report at the National Level:
Using the New LC Series Policy as an Example

John Riemer   May 12, 2006

1. "Outsource a greater proportion of standard cataloging work."
For over a decade we had agreement on the content of a standard MARC cataloging record. We were at the point of greatly expanding our reliance on others to create the one good record for all of us, be it another UC campus or a vendor like Casalini. This would serve to free up resources to address other materials with poor or no bibliographic control. Attention that could be focused in that direction is now being spent looking backwards to sudden subtractions from record content, what we can live without, how much energy certain workarounds will take for us to get what we still need.

2. "Shared central file with a single copy of each bibliographic record"
Reliance on a single file of catalog records can free institutions from complicated algorithms to merge copies of records. Sadly, OCLC is now spending time retooling its record loader so that existing series access points in WorldCat records are not lost when LC distributes its version of the catalog record to the utilities.

Consider the expense of energy and complexity in the current LC copy cataloging workflow:
a) lift the existing cataloging copy from OCLC or RLIN,
b) rework the record in the local file at LC,
c) reduce the series fields to a mere transcription of what appeared on the piece,
d) then send the revised copy of the record back as a *replacement* of what's in OCLC/RLIN.
With the announced merger of OCLC WorldCat and RLIN, could LC finally begin to catalog directly in the utility versus its own file? **Working in WorldCat, if any of us can afford to control series headings, then all of us can have them.**

3. "Cataloging as a single enterprise … agreeing on a single set of policies, sharing expertise"
In large part the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) has represented the ideal and the benefit of all parties operating on the same page of cataloging policy. After achieving agreement on cataloging standards, PCC members assumed the value of the record being created--with access points supported by authority records--and set out to achieve it as effortlessly and efficiently as possible. The more one goes it alone, the sooner will come the day when one feels compelled to start gutting the content of the record.

4. "Better navigation of large sets of search results"
The normalized access to series titles can result in the user friendly browse capability of series now found in the Endeca based North Carolina State catalog (http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/catalog). Series fields are hyperlinked. Browsing is more intuitive and requires less energy than keyword searching.

In terms of our providing at least as much functionality in the catalog as our users can find elsewhere, we should consider that online publisher catalogs frequently offer users the "more like this" convenience of browsing the other titles in a series, by clicking a series link on the description of one title. Try these two examples:
http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?ttype=2&tid=6798
http://lu.com/showbook.cfm?isbn=1591582350
Hyperlinking of series headings depends upon controlling variant forms and differentiating among series with identical names.

5. "IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)"
As recent listserv discussion has pointed out, a given series collectively represents a work. Series authority records track the multiple language expressions of the same series, the earlier-later relationships among different series, and other things. FRBR displays that seem just around the corner will be undercut by abandonment of series authority work.

Conclusion: The quality of the bibliographic services we can provide locally will suffer unnecessarily if we do not make changes at the national level along the lines suggested in the UC BSTF report.